









to the vibration oscillator, whereby said periodic moving of the planar element is generation of alarm vibration” (figure 2, figure 5, column 1 lines 55-59, column 3 lines 55-58 and column 3 lines 60-65).” (Detailed Action, item 7, page 12.)

Claims 5-7 depend from independent claim 1, and each recites features in addition to those recited in independent claim 1. Applicant submits that Siwiak fails to disclose or suggest the features of claims 5-7 demonstrated to be missing from Saarma and Suzuki, as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Thus, the combination of Saarma, Suzuki, and Siwiak fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited claims 5-7. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Saarma and Suzuki in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,927,732 to Mähringer.

The Examiner relies on Mähringer as disclosing a “receiver circuit [that] emits an acoustic wave, reading on the claimed ‘sound waves coming from outside the planar element,’ when the receiving antenna receives a wireless call signal (paragraph 8.)” (Detailed Action, Item 8, pages 12-13.)

Claim 9 depends from independent claim 1, and recites features in addition to those recited in independent claim 1. Applicant submits that Mähringer fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 9 demonstrated to be missing from Saarma and Suzuki as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Thus, the combination of Saarma, Suzuki, and Mähringer fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 9. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

Each and every point raised in the Final Office Action dated May 4, 2006 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-7 and 9-12 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: September 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Richard J. Katz

Registration No.: 47,698

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant